REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-15.

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacCormack et al. (6144797) (hereinafter referred to as "MacCormack") in view of Jain et al. (5729471) (hereinafter referred to as "Jain"). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacCormack et al. (6144797), (hereinafter referred to as "MacCormack") in view of Jain et al. (5729471), (hereinafter referred to as "Jain") in further view of Benson (5650800). Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff (6665004) in view of MacCormack et al. (6144797), (hereinafter referred to as "MacCormack").

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection over MacCormack in view of Jain, the Office Action suggests MacCormack discloses a closed circuit video surveillance system that analyzes video information. Allegedly, this system comprises a "plurality of video systems to include security cameras and video switchers and/or multiplexers" (MacCormack: figure 1, items 520-1, figure 6, item 636, column 18, lines 34-45, wherein the switches allow the user to change various aspects of the video sequence), "a plurality of security devices selected from intrusion detection, and producing alarm signals therefrom" (MacCormack: figures 154 and 155, wherein the motion detection and perimeter detection are the intrusion detection, column 18, lines 57-63, wherein the alarm is the alarm condition), "a plurality of digital interfaces connected to receive alarm signals and correlating the alarm signals with the video systems and display monitors for

sequentially displaying video images" (MacCormack: figure 1 B, wherein the video analysis and storage are the digital interfaces, column 15, lines 53-58, wherein the interface disperses or correlates signals to the appropriate cameras, figure 2, wherein the video display is the display monitor), "a computer connected to the digital interfaces" (figures 1A and 1 B, wherein the digital interface is the video analysis and storage and the computer is the master node which is connected to the digital interface through the local node), and "one or more video display monitors for automatically displaying video based on alarm signal inputs" (MacCormack: figure 2, wherein the video display is the display monitor, column 91, lines 14-20, wherein the recording is only commenced when an alarm signal is produced).

Allegedly, this system further comprises "a plurality of motion detectors, one coupled to each camera for automatically detecting moving objects" (MacCormack: fig 1 B, wherein the video analysis and storage 518 contains the algorithm for the motion detection, figure 154, wherein the motion detection parameters are set up for the corresponding cameras) and "a plurality of perimeter intrusion detection devices, at least one ITD at each location being monitored" (MacCormack: figure 155, wherein the perimeter intrusion device is the perimeter violation tool).

The Office Action further alleges that MacCormack discloses the camera movement can be carried out as described in US-5,526,041. According to the Office Action, Glatt (5526041) discloses in column 10, lines 40-67, pacing or walking the camera around the object, between left and right limit points, or pacing less than the entire range indicating a maximum distance. The Office Action recognizes that Glatt fails to use the term user-configurable, Glatt does disclose the pacing/walking as well as other

variations are programmed responses. However the Office Action recognizes that this apparatus lacks the display monitor for graphical display of alarm events in a geographic context as claimed.

According to the Office Action, Jain teaches that the correlation of scene features can be reduced by demanding that the scene and each camera view include constant and readily identifiable markers as sort of a video "grid" (Jain: column 18, lines 5-17, figure 6, wherein the grid picture represents a geographic context).

In response to this rejection, claims 1 and 7 are amended to include:

> a plurality of user interface controls for rapidly switching between at least two of a terrain point-to-fly, a sensor point-to-fly, a user-limited hemispherical constant angle-of attack orbit, and a user-limited variable radius

from page 13, line 11-page 14, line 10.

Though the Applicants contend that claims 1 and 7 are patentable in their current form, claims 1 and 7 are nevertheless amended to include the aforementioned limitations. These amendments are for clarification of the parameters of claims 1 and 7. No new matter has been added.

Neither the MacCormack nor the Jain references teach or suggest a frame of reference view operating as a function of user interface controls and respective computer logic therefore for rapidly switching between at least two of a terrain point-to-fly, a sensor point-to-fly, a user-limited hemispherical constant angle-of attack orbit, and a user-limited variable radius.

According to the Office Action, MacCormack discloses "transitions the 3D eye point of the photo-realistic simulation to a lookdown angle optimal for viewing the

simulation of the alarm inputs with rapid, smooth, and continuous motion that simulates flying in response to user selection and alarm inputs" (MacCormack: figure 161, wherein the viewing at an optimal angle is the ability to move the camera with the move button and the flight simulation is the effect of the zoom button, figure 151, wherein the user selects the sensor icons to view the corresponding video sequences). MacCormack, however does not disclose or suggest rapid switching between two of a terrain point-to-fly, sensor point-to-fly, user-limited hemispherical constant angle-of attack orbit, or user-limited variable radius. MacCormack instead controls point of view flying through a move button and a zoom button, figure 151. The interface controls for the various preset computer operations as claimed allow for rapid transition between viewing operations. This rapid transition reduces user training time as it eliminates the requirement of MacCormack of controlling zoom and move controls.

MacCormack references Glatt and suggests Glatt discloses a user configurable setting via an interface. Glatt however merely provides a system for moving a carriage mounted camera to various alarm events in a predetermined way. More importantly, Glatt does not provide multiple viewing operations or the switching between the operations as claimed. Rather, Glatt teaches away from rapid switching between viewing operations as would be included in the claimed system. Setting up a rail or track, and requiring a camera to traverse the track, (even in a configurable pattern such as the one included in Glatt) necessarily restricts switching between viewing operations and is slow and cumbersome. Further, Jain does not disclose or suggest switching between viewing operations as claimed. Jain instead is directed to operations of a video grid. column 18, lines 5-17.)

Applicants therefore submit that the combination of MacCormack and Jain would not render obvious Applicants' claimed system because MacCormack and Jain either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest rapid switching between two of a terrain point-to-fly, sensor point-to-fly, user-limited hemispherical constant angle-of - attack orbit, or user-limited variable radius.

Claims 1 and 7 are believed to be allowable for at least the aforementioned reasons. Claims 2-3 and 5-6 depend from claim 1 and claims 8-9 depend from claim 7 and are also believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacCormack in view of Jain in further view of Benson (5650800). Claim 4 depends from the amended claim 1 and is believed to be allowable for at least this reason.

Regarding the rejection of claims 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Paff (6665004) in view of MacCormack et al. (6144797), (hereinafter referred to as "MacCormack").

According to the Office Action, claim 10 is rejected because Paff discloses a security system apparatus through which an operator can easily control the security functions of the apparatus (Paff: column 1, lines 11-14). This apparatus allegedly comprises "a plurality of security devices" (Paff: column 6, lines 43-45, wherein the security devices are the fixed and movable cameras), "a virtual reality interface displaying 2D and 3D windows visualizing a real time model of a facility for display of alarm events" (Paff: figures 32 and 36, wherein the 2D and 3D windows are displayed to the user, the facility is the building), and a device interface subsystem comprising a

device icon library wherein the icons are selected from the library for representing the security devices" (Paff: figure 5, wherein each icon represents a different device). The Office Action recognizes that this apparatus lacks automatically flying to a pre-configured position optimal for viewing the security device.

The Office Action then asserts that MacCormack teaches performing a zooming-in operation upon detecting a perimeter violation on a live video feed so that the portion of the image plane corresponding to the designated perimeter is magnified. MacCormack then allegedly states that in this way a larger portion of the image plane is devoted to what is likely to be the most important information in the image stream.

In response to this rejection, the Applicants amend claim 10 such that the controller switches between points of view in response to a terrain point-to-fly interface control, a sensor point-to-fly interface control, a user-limited hemispherical constant angle-of attack orbit interface control, and a user-limited variable radius interface control, in accordance with page 13, line 11-page 14, line 10. No new matter has been added.

Paff or MacCormack either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest the amended claim 10. Paff is directed to a graphical workstation for a security system. More importantly, Paff does not disclose or suggest the aforementioned controller switching operations. Instead, Paff merely includes a conventional graphical user interface with basic scanning patterns operable by a mouse or keyboard. See e.g. Summary of the Invention. Paff does not include the switching between a terrain point-to-fly interface control, a sensor point-to-fly interface control, a user-limited hemispherical constant angle-of attack orbit interface control, and a user-limited variable radius interface control.

As discussed regarding claim 1, MacCormack, does not disclose or suggest rapid switching between a terrain point-to-fly, sensor point-to-fly, user-limited hemispherical constant angle-of attack orbit, or user-limited variable radius. MacCormack instead controls point of view flying through a move button and a zoom button, figure 151.

Therefore because all the elements of the amended claim 10 are not disclosed or suggested in the prior art, claim 10 is believed to be allowable. Claims 11-15 depend from claim 10 and are also believed to be allowable for at least this reason.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and expedient notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any further questions, he is requested to contact the undersigned.

Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to deposit account 50-0476.

Respectfully submitted,

Justin H. Purcell
Registration No. 53, 493
Attorney for Applicants
Artz & Artz, PC
28333 Telegraph Road,
Suite 250
Southfield, Michigan 48034
(248) 223-9500

Date: February 16, 2005